

January 1977

English Literature as a Liberal Study in Primary Teachers' Colleges.

D. M. Murison
La Trobe University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Liberal Studies Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Murison, D. M. (1977). English Literature as a Liberal Study in Primary Teachers' Colleges.. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 2(1).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1977v2n1.2>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol2/iss1/2>

English Literature as a Liberal Study in Primary Teachers' Colleges:

by

D. Molly Murison,

School of Education

La Trobe University

When anthropologists set forth into unknown wildernesses amid primitive tribes, they are sometimes astonished and delighted to find small pockets of high culture where none would be expected in that hostile and unsympathetic environment. Teachers of adult literature in the primary teachers' colleges sometimes have this air. They are not exactly besieged but their numbers are dwindling, while other college courses sprout with a rank lushness.

In 1972, in a survey of literature teaching in Victorian primary teachers' colleges (Murison, 1973), all but one had a year of compulsory adult literature run rather on the same lines as the Form VI Literature course, with at least some of the classics included for close study. At the time, most English lecturers considered this to be essential, and gave the reasons one has come to expect — educating the whole person, a knowledge of life and thought, vicarious experience, cultural necessity, even literature. But now much has changed, and literature lecturers, faced with offering courses which are no longer compulsory, have thought again.

Some brief commentary on the changes in the Victorian primary teachers' college curricula is necessary here. In 1973, teachers' colleges, which had been entirely controlled by the Victorian Education Department, became autonomous bodies under the central control of the State College of Victoria. Almost immediately, they, along with the Institutes of Technology, sought to up-grade their offerings — and status — by introducing a four year degree course. Some courses were written with undue ambition and undue haste, exactly as had happened in Britain in the same circumstances ten years earlier. In fact, the following paragraph from a British journal might almost have been written about the Victorian State Colleges, with the 60s and 70s concertinaed into one:

Now that the fight for status in the 1960s has been transformed into the fight for survival in the 1970s . . . (and) as the external threat has increased, the time available for planning and consultation has decreased. The need to get as many new courses approved as rapidly as possible has forced colleges either to stick to easily recognisable paradigms and frameworks which require little detailed explanation to validating agencies, or else to submit ill-considered and half-understood proposals for fashionable innovations that they think the validating agency will accept . . . Certainly it is arguable that the massive

books of course proposals which are now becoming so familiar bear more resemblance to diplomatic treaties than to educational documents. (Eraut, 1976, p.11).

One of the main changes has been the greater emphasis on theoretical work in Professional Studies — the psychology, sociology, philosophy, and history of education, and the apparently parallel importance attached to Liberal Studies, where a major and minor sequence are normally required and where the reason for this requirement is usually something to do with "personal development". Hooper (1971) comments, where we have tended not to question: "We continue to make naive assumptions about the automatic effects of different curricula . . . particularly in the field of higher education", and he adds that these assumptions underlie many compulsory liberal studies in vocational courses — and teacher training must be considered vocational. "These studies are assumed to have a variety of consequences for students' personality development regardless of the manner of student recruitment", and he doubts the effects that are "tacitly assumed or openly claimed for alleged humane studies" (p.217).

The colleges do emphasise the need for Liberal Studies, but there are a mass of options, many of them essentially practical — drama, film-making, craft of many kinds, art, music, physical education and so on.

The compulsory English Literature year has in most cases been replaced by one compulsory English unit of a semester, in most cases consisting of Children's Literature or Method of Teaching English, both being more akin to Professional Studies than Liberal Studies. The earlier claim that English literature was particularly necessary for developing the whole person has been abandoned, and authorities consider that any one of the Liberal Studies will fulfil this requirement. Just as well, if we note Hooper's (1971) comment:

Recent research at Oxford shows a disproportionate number of students of literature and philosophy among cases of psychiatric breakdown . . . There are similar findings in American research. But it seems unlikely that severe personality problems are *direct* consequences of a literary education (p.222).

The emphasis is Hooper's, and even if the consequences are indirect, I am tempted, as a literature graduate myself, to ponder all the dreadful possibilities; Hooper names his references for those who are interested in checking the research. Alvarez's "The Savage God", on the suicides of literary figures, and George Steiner on the barbarisms of some notable lovers of literature, in "Language and Silence", both suggest that perhaps thinking and feeling with too much perception could be unhinging, or that even if one feels with total empathy for literary characters and situations, it doesn't mean that one will put such insights into practice.

Interesting as it may be to speculate on the foregoing, it is hardly the reason why the numbers of primary teacher students wishing to take literature courses have diminished. Lecturers give various reasons themselves which I shall discuss later. However, less is now said by them about

"personal growth"; those who still teach serious literature see their courses as intellectual, cultural, academically demanding, and even elite. Perhaps they never really believed in the "personal growth", as their students stumbled ill-temperedly through the compulsory texts.

Does this mean that the college literature courses have returned to the Leavisite literary criticism and close textual analysis of most Australian University literature departments? Or do lecturers see these as inappropriate for the type of college course and the type of student they have, even for that select group which still chooses an adult literature major?

Malcolm Bradbury (1970) says of practical criticism:

There are signs that many of its convictions — about the primacy of the text and the power of individual technique within it; about the capacity of literature to exist autotelically, as a self-sustaining and a-historical luminous; about the force of literature as a social power . . . — are in question . . . We tend to see literature less as a force for value in society, and more as a phenomenon of it. (p.17).

The lecturers in the teachers' colleges are mostly products of Australian university literature departments, and their own students' attitudes more than any theory have prompted them to change their thinking about the content of English courses. It is such students which Hough refers to in the following:

The trouble with English Studies is that they have become too isolated, too purely literary; and purely literary studies are apt to demand either too little or too much . . . it leads to a perpetual demand for literary analysis that the generality of students are not really capable of making, for critical judgements that they have not really felt. (Hough, 1975, p.65).

Thus, the doubts similar to those expressed by Bradbury about the validity of approaches to literature, and by Hough of the capacity or the willingness of most non-university students to cope with any depth of literary analysis even if we believe such an approach to be valid, have led to a reappraisal of literature courses in Victorian primary teachers' colleges.

In fact, it does appear that in several colleges, Cowell's (1975) prognostications are being fulfilled. He suggests that an English course of the future, in institutions of higher education other than universities,

will be based on a degree of student participation unthinkable even ten years ago; it will include courses of different lengths and structures, many of them 'unit-based'; it will include a great deal of interdisciplinary work as well as the traditional single-subject Honours course; and, if 'more' is not to mean 'worse', it will continue to erode teacher/student barriers so that learning becomes a truly collaborative activity. (Cowell, p.11)

In several colleges, students do sit on course committees; the courses in an English department include term, semester and year units; methods include practical work, research and workshops as well as the usual seminar dis-

cussions and papers; and there are some interesting interdisciplinary courses in the arts (literature, music and the visual arts),

But the most touchy question is the last: has 'more' meant 'worse'? What are the standards in the primary teachers' colleges? With that accreditation requirement that college degree courses be 'comparable' with university courses, are the standards apparent in course descriptions really the standards required in practice? Are the lecturers being forced to provide courses that neither are they competent to teach, nor the students interested to take — all in the rush for standards comparable with universities, assuming of course that the standards at all the Australian universities are themselves comparable?

Some of these questions are virtually impossible to answer now, since it would be a long and touchy task to observe lecturers' teaching, or to gather assignments to compare the standards of student work accepted in different colleges and at university English departments. Without access to this information, perhaps my investigations of handbook prescriptions or even my questionnaires to college lecturers produce a picture which is not necessarily a fair one.

However, college English departments do take considerable trouble to describe at length their aims and objectives in handbooks, and compared with most university course descriptions of a title and three or four texts, the college outlines sometimes run into pages. The wording of aims, the literature to be read, the reference books prescribed, the time devoted to seminars, the quantity and variety of work expected for assessment, tell us a good deal about those who take the courses, always bearing in mind that often one lecturer writes the course outlines, and half a dozen others — not necessarily in agreement — teach the courses.

Course Outlines for 1976, the Handbooks:

Nearly all colleges offer, under the umbrella of English, a variety of year or semester units in Literature, Children's Literature, Drama, Film and Language. The Language, which does not concern us here, usually is a form of elementary linguistics, with psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic leanings towards the primary Language Arts. In most cases, it is an English alternative to Literature. The Drama, except in one case, combines a literary approach with acting and theatre, but the Film does not always include film making. In most colleges, Drama and Film are growth areas, since the number of options is far in excess of those for Literature.

Some colleges also provide courses on Media, Communication, Creative Writing and Popular Culture, but since these are not Literature courses they will not concern us here either, except that they attract students because of their "relevance", immediacy and the greater opportunity for practical involvement.

We are concerned, however, with the fate of Literature, and the first consideration is *Children's Literature*. In one college it is compulsory for a full year (60 hours), with a possibility of two further years; in another, as

an option, 120 hours are spent in the first year. In general, it appears as a 45 hour elective for one semester, and at least five colleges provide for further periods of study, two with emphasis on mythology.

The approaches vary very little. The emphasis in the handbooks is on reading the best literature with critical discrimination: to study "fine literature", "to explore and evaluate literary qualities", to "discuss critically", and one even identifies "the two Golden Ages of Children's Literature". The standard practical criticism and close textual analysis of university English departments appears to be followed with children's novels, although individual courses mention history of children's literature, popular novels and comics, and response to literature, plus classroom method. The two colleges which provide courses in mythology for second year students, and a course entitled "Self-hood in Literature", branch out into areas of psychology and theories of universal consciousness and dreams, and these courses in fact are a combination of adult and children's literature. One statement is typical of the thinking of many lecturers in Children's Literature: "Through this study will emerge the awareness that books ostensibly for children can be judged by the same criteria as any other literary works", and there underlies that statement a certain intellectual defensiveness which is generated by the attitudes of lecturers in adult literature, though not at all by the attitudes of the students, who tend to find Children's Literature the only "relevant" part of the whole literature deal.

Compared with courses five years ago, Children's Literature has grown enormously, and this is almost entirely in response to student demand, supported and strengthened by the flood of serious literary texts and journals about Children's Literature from England and America. The cult that has grown up among adults may be the product of an amnesiac nostalgia, as one writer put it, a desire to flee to fantasy or back to a supposedly innocent and still hopeful childhood, and it may be partly a cynical desire in the part of students to read only tiny books; but without doubt, lecturers and student teachers are sincere in their desire to have children read "fine literature". Why, and how, and whether it works, cannot concern us here. I only know that some years ago while I was teaching my primary student teachers "Tom's Midnight Garden", "The Little Prince" and Mayne, Garner and Garfield, my own quite literate children were devouring Blyton, "Biggles", Willard Price, Herge's "Tin Tin", many horrible books about horses and even more horrible books of the disaster films; from there they moved direct to the Brontes, Hesse, Fitzgerald, Tolstoy, and John Wyndham, mixed in with the whole teenage world of Zindel, Donovan and Wojciechowska. I had a suspicion even then that lecturers in Children's Literature do lose touch with children's books for children, and quite understandably veer off to children's books for adults — which, not surprisingly, their young adult students prefer too.

What I have just said is not a side-track, because it suggests that the Children's Literature courses may not really be about literature for children at all. However, such courses have an apparent simplicity and classroom

relevance which attract student teachers. This is less so in some of the bridging courses combining children's and adult literature which are conducted in mythology.

Rather different are the *literature courses about children* offered by three colleges. One course, in a rather confused way, aims "to explore the nature of children perceived as whole persons in relationships; the relationship of some aspects of childhood to adult perceptions"; another aims at "dealing with the experiences of young people"; a third wishes "to extend students' sympathies and experience of children and adolescents through a direct and critical confrontation with literature; and to develop an awareness of the unique insights into childhood . . . that literature has to offer". The authors to be studied are those which appear on every traditional Form 6 or University Literature course: Dickens, D.H. Lawrence, George Eliot, Twain, Joyce, and Bronte are included in all courses, and Wordsworth, Austen, Hardy, James, Gorky, Forster, Golding, L.P. Hartley, Lessing and White on some. There are no new names, and little that would not satisfy the most rigid Leavisite. We cannot be sure how different the seminar approach is, or whether the course title is just a bait for the student in search of relevance — a ruse not necessarily unacceptable in a competitive market.

Students who want relevance are not only looking at their training as primary school teachers. They want to read, they claim, about life as it is here and now. Change has been so speedy that the Nineteenth Century novels are not relevant at all. One may disagree, but there is still no literary reason why literature courses should not consist of very good modern novels.

At least seven departments offer options in *Twentieth Century literature*, and many post-war novelists are included: Murdoch, Camus, Greene, Malamud, Heller, Kenneally, White and McCullers are among them. There are no surprises, and this itself is not surprising. One course includes "modern third-rate fiction", and this being a course in Women in Literature, clearly the intent is to illustrate undesirable stereotyping. Some Communications and Media courses also include popular writing, presumably with the same intent.

We are brought to the question which perhaps should have been raised earlier. Why should a study of Literature be included in primary teachers' college courses? It seems that in 1976, English departments were divided in their official attitudes. There are still some of the "personal growth" school: one course is for the students' "personal development", and "it should . . . increase his self-awareness through his exploration of the experience of reading and his critical assessment of literary works"; another will "develop an imaginative insight into the nature of the self"; a third is "to provide material that will assist the young teacher to explore his world and make sense of it"; in still another, "students can explore the values by which men live". All these are courses in one college. In another college, the course may lead to "a better understanding of people". Only one more college refers fleetingly to "personal development" but this is

directly in relation to building "professional competence in the teaching of language in the primary school".

However, the majority of college English departments see their courses as encouraging the discriminating and critical reading of literature which (only some mention this) may lead to the enjoyment of reading. "Basic critical skills", "appropriate concepts and critical skills", "a disciplined response to his reading", "broaden literary horizons and develop the potential for reading for enjoyment", "to read and discuss literature with sympathy and discipline, and to appreciate the experience of literature", "provide students with a basic understanding of literature", "stimulate a critical interest in the appreciation of . . . creative works", "the vast heritage of literature we enjoy", "foster the alert and thoughtful reading habits that make for a satisfying personal response to literature", "develops the ability to discern and explore", and "an appreciation of the essential qualities of good literature", "promote an awareness of . . . literature": these phrases come from all college English departments, including those few which still emphasise "personal growth". From the handbooks, it appears that Literature lecturers wish to pass on a critical understanding and an appreciation of great works, even if only to those few who can cope with them; in this, they are in the Leavis tradition, and the products of the Victorian universities from which they took their English degrees.

While I have always been cynical about the "personal growth" theory which John Dixon and Holbrook so convincingly expounded to English School teachers of the late sixties, I think that the *prac. crit.* approach, though perhaps more honest in intent, is equally doubtful in results. If students don't appear to grow or develop personally through "personal growth" literature courses, then neither do many come out of *prac. crit.* and great literature courses more critical, discriminating, or appreciative of great literature.

However, there is a third approach which could be called sociological, and it is the most recent. Literature is examined as a phenomenon of the times, a product of the society which produced it. In a course based on such a view, both good and bad literature may be involved. A few colleges are exploring this approach. In one course "the concept of violence" is "considered in its expressive rather than sociological aspects", this suggesting the discredited thematic approach. However, in another college, an interesting interdisciplinary course relating music and art to literature explores "the problems facing the artist and his audience", though the final assessment appears to be based on the skills of literary criticism. Another, also interdisciplinary, uses contemporary literature and film, both fictional and non-fictional, to develop "a better understanding of people, and of the ways in which they express themselves". A third "aims to promote an awareness of . . . the interaction of society and literature". One of the most imaginative in a country college includes a study of poetry, music and film along with Australian literature, the aim being to trace aesthetic approaches to the Australian landscape — "light, heat and isolation"; and two all-day excursions are included. However, the

sociology of literature is a complex study, and leaves the way dangerously open to using a novel as some kind of historical document or contemporary case history, or else to study of the artist while ignoring the art.

In conclusion, it appears from course outlines in 1976 that, since 1972, Children's Literature has come to dominate many English departments, and can now be taken as a major study. However, despite a few sorties into themes (especially "Childhood and Youth") and some interdisciplinary sociological approaches, college English departments have kept staunchly — even rigidly — to literary criticism in the Leavis tradition, along with the novels of the Leavis tradition, too. Courses in modern novels exist in most colleges, but they keep to the safest of authors, always including some which the students who took H.S.C. Literature are bound to have studied already. Changes in the English departments have not, with one or two exceptions, been in the teaching or content of Literature courses, but in the bomb-burst growth of practical Drama, Film, Writing and Language study. Although traditional Literature courses have diminished in number, so that in most colleges only one single option in what might be called Classical Literature study (19th Century and earlier) is offered through to third year, in fact what appear to be more progressive courses are also presented in the traditional way.

The Views of English Literature Lecturers: a Questionnaire:

Lecturers from the eight major primary teachers' colleges and one Catholic college responded to a questionnaire in December, 1976, concerning the courses conducted during that year. The purpose of the questionnaire was not primarily to find figures about popularity of courses, but to see whether the attitudes of the lecturers were consistent with the statements made in the Handbooks for that year.

In all but one college, Children's Literature was the most popular course in the English department, with Drama and Film following. Lecturers agreed that Children's Literature was taught primarily as a "literary study of selected texts of accepted worth" in more than half the colleges, and as a "general study of children's books of all types" in the other half. All believed that Children's Literature should be a compulsory study, most considering one year an appropriate time.

The question asking what percentage of the students took Literature as opposed to Drama and Film, was confused by the addition of Children's Literature to the Literature figures, but where replies excluded this, between 3% and 11% took first year Literature, and from 1.7% to 7% took it on to a major. Of all options available to students in the Liberal Studies area, English in all its forms ranked third or fourth, with the exception of one Catholic college, where it ranked first with a wide range of Children's Literature options. Surprisingly, P.E. (including Health and Recreation) ranked first or second in all colleges but one, and less surprisingly, Art was usually among the first four. Social Science was first in one college, second

last in another; Mathematics and Music scarcely featured. In general, English (with Children's Literature, Film and Drama included) ranked fairly high, but Literature itself was not responsible for this.

All but two colleges had compulsory English in 1972 when I made my first survey, and only two now have; one of those which had no compulsory English has changed to compulsion. In all cases, student numbers had dropped dramatically when Literature became an option. The most frequent reason given for the drop was "the preference by students for courses which appear to relate much more directly to the classroom and their training", but others noted students' preferences for practical courses, or that primary student teachers were by their nature less likely to want academic Literature courses. Comments from lecturers included an amusingly cynical reference to "easy options for labour saving students", and comments that "students are single-mindedly seeking relevance to the job. Many don't value self education, or can't afford the time", or "I suspect most students see Children's Literature as more 'relevant' to their needs — and as making much less rigorous demands on their own capacities" — all adding up to the supposedly eternal student cry for more relevance and less work. However, two lecturers took a more positive view of students, and what they say is worth quoting. One wrote:

Students never mind any demands, e.g. more essays or books, if they are interested in the work as presented and if they are allowed a hand in deciding the direction of a year's study.

Another:

I feel intellectual differentiation is a myth. It's what is asked of them, the students, what material is presented to them, how they are challenged how high our expectations of them, all these things are the critical factors . . . I no longer believe in 'level of difficulty' . . . nor will I ever predict that students 'cannot cope' because, given the right situation, all things are possible. . . . I believe utterly that given time anyone can learn anything — which in the literature context means can grow in perception and understanding and sensitivity. That 'intellectual rigour' is now being bandied around in B.Ed. S.C.V. discussion without careful definition or classification of the term, I find very saddening.

In this lecturer's college, Literature courses hold an unusually high percentage of students. A third lecturer had a similar view:

As regards General Literature, I do not think enough has been expected from S.C.V. students. It seems to be assumed that they will reach a lower level than university students, but I suspect that if they were more sternly challenged (i.e. in quality and number of demands made upon them) this would prove not to be a tenable view.

However, enough other replies included views that "we ought to recognise that most of our students are less intellectually gifted than undergraduates, and much less interested in pure academic subjects", and that we have to be "aware of the difficulties students have in Literature courses, which basically are expressed in terms of 'too demanding'." One

regretful respondent, commenting on the decline in student numbers in Literature courses, wondered "whether we aren't teaching it very well", and it strikes me that that could account for the apparent contradiction in the views I have quoted. Interestingly, those three lecturers who commented so confidently on the student teachers' capacities to do better, have all at some time been tutors in university departments, and are likely to be aware of comparative university standards and requirements.

In general, most supported a much greater diversity than normally found in university English departments: "I feel our institutions and courses are wrong in trying to ape universities". One commented on "a move away from the traditionalist or classical emphasis and an affirmation of the idea of contemporary relevance", and another, "we are not in the business of training literary critics a la university English departments — more in the game of alerting them imaginatively and intellectually to the variety of the world they live in". Other lecturers saw their courses in a similar light: "The human dilemma is explored and pondered on — with all the advantages of the artistic mode as the expressive entity". "Developing students as persons of sensibility and highly developed interest in literature . . . insights into human nature from reading. In addition, students who can follow through a deep enthusiasm for any subject like literature are surely stronger and more perceptive for their experience of success in this area".

Despite these claims, the courses both in aim and content do not appear to be markedly different from the Great Books subjected to close textual analysis of university courses; and the students are not attracted to studies which claim to offer them such worthwhile life experiences. They still prefer the safe world of Children's Literature, and the practical activity of Drama and Film, or of Physical Education and Art.

It is not only the students whose enthusiasm for adult Literature is waning. There was a note of anger from the lecturers at the attitudes of the college authorities to Literature and the Humanities. "We detect an increased sociological-psychological behaviourist trend in course planning, new staff appointments, to be frank, an anti-humanities swing that is as deliberate as it is hard to fight — the devious double-speak techniques by which new sociological and psychological methods proliferate." Another said, "the college doesn't care about English, and pushes P.E. and Community and Schools areas. This is shown in things like allocation of money, etc.".

This forces Literature lecturers to forward their own causes with some cynicism. One lecturer felt pressured to conform to university literary titles on the one hand, and to educational jargon on the other:

I feel at our college, we are constantly having to — since 1975 — apologise for our more creative courses and their labels. "Passion and Society" for example, the title coming most appropriately from Denis de Rougemont's book, they would much prefer to have called "The Romantic Movement and its Break from the Enlightenment." "Mother Goose"

(which studies nursery rhyme literature, lore and language, the Opies' or Baring Gould's historical research, Maurice Sendak's attack on Wildsmith, etc.) was seen as offensive to particularly male students' egos! We have jokingly subtitled it as 'infant pedagogical literature' because we feel this sort of gobbledegook or educational garbage is currently being smiled on.

Conclusion

There seems to be no doubt that primary teachers' college English departments are in a state of flux, of reviewing their aims and attitudes to Literature teaching, to their students, and to their relationship to the total teacher training course. Some would determinedly challenge those few students who remain loyal to Literature with demanding intellectual courses, others would diversify to tap other areas less traditional or purely literary. A few have become cynical about college policy, student attitudes and ability, and ultimately their own courses.

However, despite the many developments, the literary critical approach remains, and appears to satisfy a small group of students and many lecturers who feel it has the ultimate status. And the standard course texts do not vary much from those of H.S.C. or University Literature departments. But lecturers in Literature appear also to be positive and optimistic about changes, and about the need for Literature courses in some form. Nevertheless, there has been a great drop in numbers of students taking optional courses which were previously compulsory, and a meteoric rise in the popularity of Children's Literature. The greatest change has been in the breadth of the content of Children's Literature; courses in mythology and epic and folklore, plus others combining children's and adult novels on particular themes, appear in several colleges, and Children's Literature can usually now be taken as a two year minor, or even in some cases, a three year major study. In many colleges, one hundred percent of students take this option, while in other colleges it is a compulsory study for willing students. Added to Children's Literature, is the enormous rise in popularity of the many courses in Drama and Film. Nevertheless, no lecturers in Literature seriously considered their courses irrelevant, nor did they generally think them too difficult. But they felt that students, and even the college authorities, did view the Literature courses in this way.

Teachers' college lecturers are not alone in this, for there has been a considerable questioning of Literature courses in University English departments, very much along the same lines. (1) So it is not quite enough to accuse lazy students of wanting to read short children's books, to fiddle

(1) Some Australian Universities do offer Drama or Film, and in a South Australian University English department, there is even an undergraduate unit in Children's Literature — a study which in U.S. warrants numerous Professors and produces an annual flock of Ph.D's.

about with cameras and disport themselves in psychodrama on the stage, all so that they can avoid intellectual effort. The trend is only part of a much wider disillusionment with the Arnold/Eliot/Leavis idea of Great Literature as the one means of preserving our degenerating culture, and although there might be some truth in the accusation that teachers' colleges are presently floundering in a morass of educational jargon, nobody is so sure that the one firm spot is in the area of Literature.

References

- ALVAREZ, A., *The Savage God*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1974.
 BRADBURY, M., "The State of Criticism Today," in Bradbury M. (ed.) *Contemporary Criticism*, London, Edward Arnold, 1970.
 COWELL, R., *The Critical Enterprise: English Studies in Higher Education*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1975.
 ERAUT, M.R., "Some Perspectives on Curriculum Development in Teacher Education," *Education for Teaching*, 99, 1976, pp.11 - 21.
 HOOPER, R., (ed). *The Curriculum: Context, Design and Development*, Oliver and Boyd, 1971.
 HOUGH, "Crisis in the Humanities" in Cowell, R., *The Critical Enterprise: English Studies in Higher Education*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1975.
 MURISON, D.M., Literature — A Losing Cause? A limited study of student attitudes to literature courses in Victorian Teachers' Colleges, *English in Australia*, 25, 1973, pp.21-45.
 STEINER, G., *Language and Silence*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1969.
 College Handbooks of the Constituent Colleges of the State College of Victoria, 1976.

Expectations of Gifted Children in the Primary-Secondary Transition

by M.E. Poole

A.J. Williams

Macquarie University

From the large body of evidence regarding the personality and ability characteristics of creative adults and children, a stereotype emerges of the high creative as a somewhat bohemian person who flaunts convention (Mackinnon, 1962), works erratically by insight, is intuitive and emotional (Barron, 1963; Cross, Cattell and Butcher, 1967). Such a person, because of his high but idiosyncratic standards for his products, suffers neither fools nor mediocrities with any great patience. Taft (1971) has refined the concept of creativity operating within a person as involving both "hot" creativity (insight, intuition, expanded states of consciousness) and "cold" creativity which is more concerned with controlled problem-solving, seeing an idea through to production, care in finish, and so on.

Bachtold's (1974) study further modified the image of the high creative adolescent as distinctively rebellious when she found that the subjects in her study rated "health", "consideration for others", "sense of humour", "does work on time", "never bored" above qualities such as "independent thinking", "intuitive", "adventurous" and "self sufficient".

Despite the comprehensiveness of the creativity literature, there are few studies that deal directly with the perceptions of creative children in their everyday concerns. This absence of information is partly due to its "non-scientific" nature, as non-formal, open-ended questionnaires yield data that are difficult to codify and validate. Increasingly, however, educators are turning to ethnomethodology as providing wider and more appropriate knowledge for their purposes.

The La Trobe Longitudinal Study on Creativity included formal test batteries, questionnaires and inventories as well as idiographic profiles and non-structured tasks such as the present.

Subjects were selected from one thousand Victorian metropolitan sixth-graders from state and independent schools on the basis of performance on the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (1966). Approximately the top four percent were selected for longitudinal study, and were tested over a four-year period both at the University, at school and at home. In this case, all selected subjects were asked to document their expectations of secondary school prior to Form 1 entry; at the end of Form 1 they were asked to evaluate their school experiences. As there were no pre-set categories, the students' replies are reported according to qualitative grouping and frequency of response where applicable.